

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>				1. Contract ID Code <small>Firm-Fixed-Price</small>		Page 1 Of 12	
2. Amendment/Modification No.  0005		3. Effective Date  2011JAN19		4. Requisition/Purchase Req No.  SEE SCHEDULE		5. Project No. (If applicable)	
6. Issued By  U.S. ARMY CONTRACTING COMMAND CCTA-AHL ANDRE SHINA (586)282-3750 WARREN, MICHIGAN 48397-5000 HTTP://CONTRACTING.TACOM.ARMY.MIL  EMAIL: ANDRE.SHINA@US.ARMY.MIL		Code W56HZV		7. Administered By (If other than Item 6)		Code	
				SCD      PAS      ADP PT			
8. Name And Address Of Contractor (No., Street, City, County, State and Zip Code)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		9A. Amendment Of Solicitation No.  W56HZV-11-R-0001	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2010NOV30	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		10A. Modification Of Contract/Order No.	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		10B. Dated (See Item 13)	
Code		Facility Code					
<b>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</b>							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning <u>2</u> signed copies of the amendments: (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. <b>FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.</b> If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. Accounting And Appropriation Data (If required)							
<b>13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS</b> It Modifies The Contract/Order No. As Described In Item 14.							
<input type="checkbox"/> A. This Change Order is Issued Pursuant To: The Contract/Order No. In Item 10A.		The Changes Set Forth In Item 14 Are Made In					
<input type="checkbox"/> B. The Above Numbered Contract/Order Is Modified To Reflect The Administrative Changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) Set Forth In Item 14, Pursuant To The Authority of FAR 43.103(b).							
<input type="checkbox"/> C. This Supplemental Agreement Is Entered Into Pursuant To Authority Of:							
<input type="checkbox"/> D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the Issuing Office.							
14. Description Of Amendment/Modification (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)  SEE SECOND PAGE FOR DESCRIPTION							
15A. Name And Title Of Signer (Type or print)				16A. Name And Title Of Contracting Officer (Type or print)			
15B. Contractor/Offeror  _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. Date Signed		16B. United States Of America  By _____ /SIGNED/ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. Date Signed	
NSN 7540-01-152-8070 PREVIOUS EDITIONS UNUSABLE				30-105-02		STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243	

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b>  <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-11-R-0001 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0005	<b>Page</b> 2 <b>of</b> 12
---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION  
The purpose of Amendment 0005 to RFP W56HZV-11-R-0001 is:

1. To change the word 'risks' to 'risk' in the first sentence of paragraph M.4.3.
2. To add the following to the Section A Executive Summary under the heading 'OSD CAPE ACCESS TO PROPOSAL INFORMATION':  
  

"In complying with the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009, certain contractor bid or proposal information and/or source selection information may be disclosed to the Office of Secretary of Defense Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (OSD CAPE) for the purposes of developing and validating the GCV Independent Cost Estimate in support of Milestone A approval. Any OSD CAPE personnel provided this information shall be Government employees and must be specifically authorized to receive the information by the Contracting Officer. In order to protect the integrity of the acquisition process, any information disclosed to the OSD CAPE personnel will be clearly identified as contractor bid or proposal information and/or source selection information with clear notification to protect the information."
3. All other terms and conditions of this RFP, except as amended herein, remain unchanged.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE A0006 \*\*\*

Notwithstanding the designation on the cover page of this Request for Proposal (RFP), the GCV IFV TD phase contract will not be D0A4 rated and will have no rating until the production phase is initiated.

Additionally, electronic submission of proposals, notwithstanding any such clauses to the contrary in this RFP, is not an acceptable form of proposal delivery. The specific direction for proposal delivery is located in Section L of this RFP.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV)  
Technology Development (TD) Phase  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL # W56HZV-11-R-0001

Additional GCV IFV information is contained at the GCV IFV webpage at <http://contracting.tacom.army.mil/majorsys/gcv/gcv.htm>

INTRODUCTION  
  
Request for Proposal W56HZV-11-R-0001 (RFP) is hereby issued by the US Army TACOM Life Cycle Management Command (LCMC) for the TD phase of the GCV IFV program. The Army has established a GCV IFV program to develop and procure ground combat vehicles. The GCV IFV program uses an incremental or block approach to develop and procure ground combat vehicles based on technology maturity, schedule and affordability constraints while addressing key operational gaps.

The first ground combat vehicle will be the GCV IFV offering a highly-survivable platform for delivering a nine-Soldier infantry squad to the battlefield. The GCV IFV is the first vehicle that will be designed and developed to operate in an improvised explosive device (IED) environment and will be highly survivable, mobile and versatile. Future increments are yet to be defined but may be focused on capability improvements and/or additional GCV variants as the Army defines specific requirements.

This RFP represents the Army's sole request for this requirement. The prior solicitation for the GCV IFV TD Phase is cancelled in its entirety and no longer informs this RFP in any fashion.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PHASE AFFORDABILITY  
  
Any proposal received in response to this RFP that proposes a price in excess of \$450,000,000 will be considered unaffordable.

GCV IFV PROGRAM INTENT  
  
The GCV IFV Program's intent is to develop and deliver an affordable and effective infantry fighting vehicle in seven years by utilizing mature technologies and focusing on system design that integrates all subsystems and components.

It is the Government's intent for contractors to utilize mature, low-risk technologies. To this end, offerors need to identify their approaches to maximize the inclusion of mature technologies selected, giving consideration to any modifications necessary for effective integration. Offerors may non-developmental, modified non-developmental or developmental solutions. The specific evaluation criteria are described in Section M of this RFP.

The GCV IFV Program is driven to achieve four primary imperatives referred to as the "Big Four". These imperatives have been decomposed into the Tier One (1) GCV IFV Performance Specification requirements.

<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-11-R-0001 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0005	<b>Page</b> 3 <b>of</b> 12
<b>Name of Offeror or Contractor:</b>		

These "Big Four" imperatives are defined as follows:

- Force Protection is achieving a threshold level of protection for all occupants against the threats identified in the classified annex of the GCV IFV Performance Specification.
- Capacity is a vehicle crew and a fully-equipped nine soldier Infantry squad.
- Full Spectrum is a versatile platform able to adapt and/or enhance capabilities through configuration changes of armor and network while providing for growth over time in terms of size, weight, power and cooling.
- Timing is the delivery and acceptance of the first production GCV IFV vehicle within seven years of the TD phase contract award.

Offerors must balance Affordability with the achievement of the "Big Four" imperatives. The Government's average Unit Manufacturing Cost target for the GCV IFV Program is \$9,000,000 to \$10,500,000 per unit expressed in Government fiscal year 2010 constant dollars (as defined by the 2010 Office of the Secretary of Defense Inflation Guidance FY2011 President's Budget). In addition, the GCV IFV target Operation & Sustainment cost is \$200 per mile expressed in Government fiscal year 2010 constant dollars (as defined by the 2010 Office of the Secretary of Defense Inflation Guidance FY2011 President's Budget).

The GCV IFV has three Tiers of requirements (Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3), the definitions of which are contained in Attachment 026 to this RFP. In responding to the RFP, offerors are encouraged to perform tradeoff analysis within the available trade space of the GCV IFV requirement, defined as the Tier Two and Tier Three requirements listed in Attachment 026, to provide an affordable, capable vehicle within seven years of TD phase contract award.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY (GFP)/GOVERNMENT FURNISHED EQUIPMENT (GFE)

No GFP or GFE is offered as part of this RFP. Offerors may request GFP and GFE as part of their proposals provided they identify the Government Program or Agency that is to provide the GFP/GFE along with documentation that the Government Program Agency agrees to provide the GFP/GFE and the GFP/GFE will be available for the requested period.

GCV IFV OVERALL PROGRAM APPROACH

Technology Development Phase

The GCV IFV development effort will consist of three phases: Technology Development (TD), Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD), and Production and Deployment (PD).

The goal of the TD phase is to reduce overall risk for entering into the EMD phase by developing an affordable, feasible and operationally effective preliminary design. The 24 month period of performance will focus on development of a system design that integrates all subsystems and components to reduce technical risk and balances affordability with system performance.

The key program event of the TD phase is the Preliminary Design Review (PDR) which will be held no later than 18 months after award of the TD phase contracts. Upon completion of the PDR, TD phase contractors will continue to reduce integration risk while maturing their designs and incorporate key findings from the PDR. In addition, TD phase contractors will further refine the Unit Manufacturing Cost (UMC) estimates and focus on any contract requirements that are not yet completed during the remainder of the TD phase per the Statement of Work (Attachment 001).

The Government intends to award up to three (3) Fixed Price Incentive Fee(FPIF) contract(s) for the TD phase. The share ratio for overruns is 0/100 (Government/Contractor) and the share ratio for underruns is 80/20 (Government/Contractor). Refer to FAR clause 52.216-16 located at I-132 of this RFP for additional detail regarding Incentive Fee. The share ratios are not subject to negotiation. Proposals offering an alternative share ratio or contract type will not be considered. Selection of the offeror(s) for this phase will be based on the assessment of proposals submitted in response to this RFP and evaluated in accordance with Section M.

During performance of the TD phase contracts, contractors are required to deliver the following two subsystem prototypes: (i) a Mine Blast Subsystem Prototype Test Article; and (ii) a Rocket Propelled Grenade Protection Subsystem Prototype. In addition to these required prototypes, offerors may propose prototypes in addition to the two specified to mitigate areas of risk in their proposed initial concepts. However, the Government will not take delivery of any additional prototypes for testing.

A large aspect of the GCV IFV TD phase is preparation for a seamless entrance into the EMD phase. Therefore, as part of its proposal, offerors are required to submit an Integrated Master Plan (IMP) that contains events, accomplishments and criteria through delivery of the First Full-Up Prototype Vehicle (30 months from award of the EMD contract). Similarly, offerors are required to submit an Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) that contains planning packages through delivery of the Early Prototype (-) vehicle (12 months from award of the EMD contract).

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-11-R-0001      MOD/AMD 0005</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Page 4 of 12</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) phase

The EMD Phase, which is currently planned to be solicited in Fiscal Year 2013, will focus on completing a GCV IFV detailed design, building integrated GCV IFV prototypes, further reducing integration risk and conducting key tests including Production Qualification Testing (PQT), a Limited User Test, and ballistic survivability testing. EMD contracts will include a 48 month period of performance and will be awarded based on a best value source selection to select up to two (2) contractors based upon price, schedule and technical performance. It is the intent of the Army to limit competition to the TD phase contractors. If the Army does not obtain approval for limited competition, then the solicitation for the EMD phase will be issued on the basis of full and open competition.

It is anticipated that the criteria listed below will be principal determining factors in EMD contract award. Detailed evaluation criteria for the source selection are anticipated to be available within the first year of the TD phase.

Potential evaluation criteria, which may change based upon changing circumstances and the needs of the Army, for the EMD competition may include the evaluation of a proposal that:

- Is affordable within the EMD price, UMC targets, and O&S cost targets
- Achieves the Tier 1 GCV IFV Performance Specification requirements
- Exhibits a high level of design maturity (e.g. drawings completed, Substantiating engineering analysis, logical architecture defined, low risk software build plan in place, etc.)
- Provides the warfighter with operational utility
- Achieves identified reliability levels
- Contains a credible EMD plan that includes the delivery of prototypes to test in accordance with the GCV IFV Program Plan (Attachment 008).
- Mitigates integration risks prior to completion of EMD to demonstrate compliance with the GCV IFV Performance Specification established at MS B.
- Has the ability to deliver EMD prototypes with capability to successfully execute the Limited User Test
- Contains an executable EMD schedule to produce, deliver, and test EMD prototypes and prepare for successful delivery of the first production vehicle
- Achieves as much capability of the Tier 2 GCV IFV Performance Specification requirements as possible
- Credibly achieves performance levels between threshold to objective in specified GCV IFV Performance Specification requirements
- Limits restrictions on the Government's ability to use or disclose technical data

At this time, in an effort to reduce integration risk, 15 GCV IFV integrated system prototypes are planned to be required during the EMD phase from each contractor. These include the delivery of 3 integrated Early Prototype (-) vehicles (two for government testing and one delivered to the contractor integration facility for contractor integration testing) prior to the delivery of the 12 First Full-Up Prototype vehicles. The Early Prototypes (-) are to be representative of the target design for the capabilities listed in the EMD solicitation with minimal surrogate hardware and are targeted to support technical risk reduction and design feedback.

In an effort to reduce integration risk, the EMD scope will require the delivery (see Attachment 008) of three (3) Early Prototype (-) vehicles (two for Government testing and one delivered to the contractor integration facility) that contain the following (as such, components (hardware and software) delivered should represent the target design for the capabilities listed with minimal representative (surrogate) supporting hardware/software):

- Hull structure and compartmentation, propulsion system, suspension, power generation, distribution and management, crew/dismount capacity and seating
- Turret structure with compartmentation and primary weapon, coax, CIWS, missile, target acquisition sensors, fire control, target handoff capability (hunter-killer) and manual backup operation of weapons
- Modular armor with attachments
- Associated computing and data distribution infrastructure/architecture (e.g., databus, operating system, middleware)
- Associated crew station (e.g., user interface, inceptor, etc.)

Delivery of Early Prototype (-) vehicles will initiate developmental testing to checkout and verify integrated design capabilities and provide feedback to critical design activities for implementation of appropriate corrective actions ahead of the CDR and delivery of

<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b>  <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-11-R-0001 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0005	<b>Page</b> 5 <b>of</b> 12
---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

First Full-Up Prototype vehicles.

Production and Deployment (P&D) phase

The Government currently plans to solicit for the P&D phase in Fiscal Year 2017, and may award one or more contracts for the P&D phase. It is anticipated that meeting delivery schedules and vehicle pricing will be the principal determining factors in selecting a P&D phase contractor(s). The P&D phase will update the detailed vehicle design in preparation for full rate production. The Government intends to request separate pricing for a Technical Data Package (TDP) to be evaluated as part of the award for the P&D phase.

**MGV BODY OF KNOWLEDGE**

Offerors may choose to leverage the development from the cancelled Manned Ground Vehicle (MGV) program. This data, referred to as the MGV Body of Knowledge (BoK) may be accessed through registration at Federal Business Opportunities (fbo.gov). Registration requires a valid CAGE code that is not currently on the Excluded Parties List (EPLRS). Use of this data is not required for proposal submission. The Government will maintain the MGV BoK at the FBO website until the closing date for submission of proposals.

The link to the FBO website is the following:

[https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=5b5248bf45d727858bb74a693de21f93&tab=core&\\_cview=1](https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=5b5248bf45d727858bb74a693de21f93&tab=core&_cview=1)

Additional information on accessing the MGV Body of Knowledge is the following:

<http://contracting.tacom.army.mil/majorsys/gcv/gcv.htm>

**CLASSIFIED INFORMATION**

Classified Information Request Procedures: Offerors must have a valid US security clearance of SECRET or higher in order to respond to this RFP, because the RFP includes an annex classified at the SECRET level which will be released only to offerors possessing the appropriate clearance. All classified material must be handled in accordance with the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM), DoD 5220.22-M and the DD-254 for this RFP (Attachment 009). The classified annex to the RFP will only be sent on electronic media (CD/DVD). As a result, an Information Systems clearance of at least SECRET will be required to view the Classified Annex to this RFP.

While only a SECRET clearance is required to receive the classified annex to this RFP, contract performance will require SECRET/Special Access Required (SAR) facility and Information System clearances. See Attachments 009 and 010, GCV IFV DRAFT DD-254 and GCV DRAFT Security Classification Guide, respectively, for more information on the requirements for receiving and handling classified information in conjunction with the RFP and resulting contracts.

Requests for the classified portion of this RFP must be made by the offeror's Facility Security Officer (FSO) via e-mail to DAMI\_GCV@conus.army.mil with the title "Request for GCV RFP Classified Annex".

Requests made by other than the FSO will not be processed.

Contractors must destroy classified material received or generated under contracts resulting from this RFP not later than 2 years following completion of the contract or as soon as it is no longer needed, whichever comes first. Firms that do not submit a proposal or who withdraw their proposals must destroy or return classified material generated or received under this RFP not later than 180 days after the opening date of proposals. Firms who submit a proposal that is not accepted by the Government or does not result in a contract award to the firm have 180 days after notification to destroy or return classified information.

The following information must be provided and must match the offeror's information in the Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD):

- The Company Name and Classified Mailing Address (must match ISFD information)
- CAGE Code
- Name of Facility Security Officer (FSO) with Telephone Number(s), Datafax Number, and E-mail Address
- CAGE Code(s) and Address(es) of the Company Facility (Facilities) intended to participate in Proposal Preparation and Performance of the GCV IFV Program where classified material will be utilized.

**CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION**

Controlled Unclassified Information(CUI)Request Procedures: This RFP contains CUI that will only be sent to offerors upon an approved

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued  PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-11-R-0001MOD/AMD 0005	Page 6 of 12
--------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

request. The below Attachments and Exhibits contain CUI:

Attachment 0001 (Statement of Work)  
Attachment 0002 (GCV IFV Performance Specification)  
Attachment 0004 (GCV IFV Reliability Failure Definition and Scoring Criteria)  
Attachment 0005 (GCV IFV Operational Mode Summary/Mission Profile)  
Attachment 0009 (GCV IFV DRAFT DD-254)  
Attachment 0010 (GCV Draft Security Classification Guide)  
Attachment 0012 (Work Breakdown Structure)  
Attachment 0015 (Equipment Stowage List Requirements)  
Attachment 0018 (DOORS GCV IFV Performance Specification)  
Attachment 0020 (Subsystem Prototype Test Asset Requirements Matrix)  
Attachment 0025 (GCV IFV Specification Requirements Matrix)  
Attachment 0026 (GCV IFV Performance Specification Tiered Requirements List\_Compliance Matrix)  
Exhibit A (Contract Data Requirements List)  
Exhibit B (Government Furnished Information\_Interface Control Documents)

Any CUI material held by an offeror not awarded a GCV IFV TD phase contract shall be destroyed in accordance with the Controlled Unclassified Information document provided with the CUI information 30 days after award of the GCV IFV TD contract or cancellation of this RFP, and destruction receipts certifying destruction will be provided to the Contracting Officer.

In addition, note that certain attachments to the RFP have limited distribution and/or export controlled statements in accordance with DoD Directive, Distribution Statements on Technical Documents. The most restricted level of distribution on CUI is Distribution Statement F.

Offerors must also state in their request that the offeror in possession of the documents will comply with the handling requirements of DoDD 5230.24 and DoDD 5230.25. Upon receipt of the CUI, receipts will review Attachment 10 (GCV DRAFT Security Classification Guide)and immediately advise the PCO if they are unable to handle the CUI in accordance with the applicable provisions of this attachment. If this is the case, the receipt shall not view any other portion of the CUI until additional instruction is received.

Requests for CUI documents must made to the Contract Specialist via e-mail at DAMI\_GCV@conus.army.mil with the Subject [Name of Requesting Firm-Request for GCV IFV CUI Documentation] Requests must completely address all information identified above incomplete requests will not be considered. The Government reserves the right to request additional information as required.

Requests for any CUI must clearly state:

- The Company Name and Mailing Address (must match CAGE code address) where the electronic media (CD/DVD) is to be sent
- CAGE Code
- Point of Contact (POC) with Telephone Number(s), Datafax Number, and electronic mail Address
- CAGE Code(s) and Address(es) of the Company Facility (Facilities) intended to participate in Proposal Preparation and Performance of the GCV IFV Program
- In the event your firm does not possess a CAGE code, the Certification of Proposal Preparation and Performance Facility (Facilities) identifying qualification in accordance with paragraph 3.2 of DoDD 5230.25, Withholding of Unclassified Technical Data from Public Disclosure for those companies that do not have a CAGE Code assigned must be completed.

Offerors approved to receive the CUI documents will receive an electronic mail from the Contract Specialist confirming approval of the request. Following approval, the Government will send, via postal mail or an overnight carrier (e.g. FedEx, USPS), the CUI information on a CD-ROM to the address provided in the request.

See Section L of this RFP for proposal submission instructions.

**ARMOR RECIPE**

The Army is funding the development of light weight high performance armor, the recipe of which may, at the discretion of the offeror, be utilized to provide the GCV IFV protection levels required by the GCV IFV Performance Specification. The armor recipe is provided in the classified annex to this RFP. There will be no inherent advantage or inherent disadvantage to an offeror that selects the Army armor solution. Each solution will be evaluated on its own merits. It is the responsibility of the offeror to select the armor solution best suited for their design to meet the relevant requirements of the GCV IFV Performance Specification.

**WALK-THROUGH OF PRICE VOLUME**

At a time to be determined after proposal submission, but not earlier than seven calendar days after, each offeror shall be prepared to

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b></p> <p> <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-11-R-0001      <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0005 </p>	<p><b>Page</b> 7 <b>of</b> 12</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

provide a walk-through, to be held in a location to be determined within the Detroit Metropolitan Area, of the Price Volume of its proposal for the purpose of enhancing the Government's understanding of the structure and organization of the submitted Price Volume. It is the Government's intention to schedule an appointment for each offeror. The walk through will be determined after receipt of proposals. A time frame of no more than 4 hours will be provided to each offeror. If the Competitive Range has not yet been established, discussions as defined in FAR 15.306(d) will not be permitted during this walk through.

DYNAMIC OBJECT-ORIENTED REQUIREMENTS SYSTEM (DOORS) COMPATIBLE GCV IFV PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATION

A DOORS compatible performance specification is provided as Attachment 0018 to this RFP. If any inconsistency between the DOORS version and the '.pdf' version (Attachment 0002) is present, the requirement as defined by Attachment 0002 prevails.

NOTICE REGARDING SUBCONTRACTING

L.8 Small Business Participation Factor Volume. Percentages are calculated using proposed total CONTRACT Target Price as the denominator and include first tier (refers to subcontracting, not specification level) subcontracting only. Goals for evaluation purposes are contained in M.4.

Section I - Subcontracting Plan clauses. Percentages are calculated based on total SUBCONTRACTING amount as the denominator and include first tier subcontracting only.

H-101 Use of Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan and GCV IFV - Internal Subcontract Reporting. If a Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan is incorporated into a contract resulting from this solicitation, the contractor must submit a report listing total small business subcontracting DOLLARS for first tier subcontracts issued under the contract. No Percentages are required in this report. The report is in ADDITION to any reports required to be submitted into eSRS.

OSD CAPE ACCESS TO PROPOSAL INFORMATION

In complying with the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009, certain contractor bid or proposal information and/or source selection information may be disclosed to the Office of Secretary of Defense Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (OSD CAPE) for the purposes of developing and validating the GCV Independent Cost Estimate in support of Milestone A approval. Any OSD CAPE personnel provided this information shall be Government employees and must be specifically authorized to receive the information by the Contracting Officer. In order to protect the integrity of the acquisition process, any information disclosed to the OSD CAPE personnel will be clearly identified as contractor bid or proposal information and/or source selection information with clear notification to protect the information.

The Period of Performance for this contract will be for 24 months after contract award.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE A0001 \*\*\*

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-11-R-0001      MOD/AMD 0005</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Page 8 of 12</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 Basis of Award.

M.1.1 The Government desires to make up to three (3) awards as a result of this RFP (subject to the conditions described in M.3.1.1 below). The Government will select up to three (3) proposals which represent the best value to the Government as described below. When proposals non-Price Factors are essentially equal, Price to the Government may be controlling in determining the successful offerors.

There are five evaluation factors: (1) Technical, (2) Schedule, (3) Price, (4) Past Performance and (5) Small Business Participation. The relative order of importance of these factors (and sub-factors where applicable) is set forth in M.4 below.

M.1.1.1 Requirement for Facility Clearance (SECRET). Portions of the information on this program will be classified as SECRET. To be considered for award, offerors must have a SECRET Facility Clearance (FCL). Offerors must submit documentation indicating their facility has been granted a SECRET FCL. Offerors who are considering a subcontractor must also submit documentation indicating that its subcontractor has obtained the necessary clearance in order to be considered for award for those subcontractors that will handle classified material. All FCL information will be verified through the Defense Security Service for all offerors and their subcontractors. Offerors without a security FCL will neither be able to discuss or access key aspects of the program that are classified nor will they be able to pass such information on to their subcontractor. Access to SECRET/SAR information will be required under the contract resulting from this RFP.

M.1.1.1.1 Export Controlled Information. This RFP contains Export Controlled information in Controlled Unclassified Attachments and within the Classified Annex to this RFP. Certain aspects of the Classified Annex are marked SECRET/NOFORN. It is the responsibility of the offeror, not the Government, to obtain the necessary export licenses to share any such information with subcontractors or to obtain access to the files themselves. The failure or inability of an offeror to obtain the appropriate license or agreement will not be considered as a mitigating factor in the evaluation process. In essence, if the appropriate information is not conveyed in the proposal or in the discussion process, an offeror's risk rating may be impacted.

M.1.1.2 Requirement for Information System Clearances. The Government will evaluate the documentation submitted in L.9.6 confirming the offeror and subcontractors, as applicable, have FCL and Information System Security clearances capable of handling, at a minimum, data and information classified SECRET prior to the close of discussions.

M.2 Rejection of Offers. In accordance with FAR 52.215-1 Alt. I contained in this RFP, the Government may reject any or all proposals if such action is in the Government's interests. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Merely offers to perform work according to the RFP terms or fails to present more than a statement indicating its capability to comply with the RFP terms without support and elaboration as specified in Section L of this RFP; or
- b. Reflects an inherent lack of technical competence or a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks required to perform the RFP requirements, that may include submission of a proposal which is unrealistically high or low in Price or unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments; or
- c. Contains any unexplained significant inconsistency between the proposed effort and Price proposal, which implies that the offeror has (1) an inherent misunderstanding of the scope of work, or (2) an inability to perform the resultant contract; or
- d. Is unbalanced as to Price. An unbalanced offer is one, which is based on pricing significantly high or low for one given period versus another period. There must be a direct relationship between the effort expended and its Price for each incrementally funded period; or
- e. Offers a product or services that do not meet all stated material requirements of the RFP; or
- f. Proposes exceptions to the attachments, exhibits, enclosures, or other RFP terms and conditions; or
- g. Requests more than \$450,000,000 in funding for the TD phase or is otherwise unaffordable for the TD phase; or
- h. Fails to meaningfully respond to the Proposal preparation instructions specified in Section L of this RFP.

M.3 Evaluation and Source Selection Process

M.3.1 Evaluation Process. Selection of the successful offeror(s) shall be made following an assessment of each proposal, based on the response to the information requested in Section L of this RFP and against the RFP requirements and the evaluation criteria described in Section M herein. Proposals will be evaluated as specified herein, to include developing narrative support for the evaluation conclusions under each Factor and Sub-factor. The Government reserves the right to reject proposals, in accordance with RFP provision M.2 above. An offeror will only be eligible to receive one (1) award regardless of the number of proposals it submits. It is the Government's intent to award up to three (3) contracts to three (3) separate offerors competing independently that do not share a common parent, do not have a parent/subsidiary relationship with the other awardee(s), and are not affiliates (as defined in FAR 19.101) of the other awardee(s).



<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-11-R-0001 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0005	<b>Page</b> 9 <b>of</b> 12
<b>Name of Offeror or Contractor:</b>		

M.3.1.1 The evaluation of proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall be conducted on a source selection basis utilizing a "trade-off" process to obtain the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to an offeror(s) who gives the greatest confidence it will best meet the requirements affordably. The Government will weigh the evaluated proposal (other than the Price Factor) against the evaluated Price to the Government. As part of the best value determination, the Government will assess the risks of each proposal, that include its strengths and weaknesses, in selecting the proposal(s) that are most advantageous and represent the best overall value to the Government. In utilizing the "trade-off" process to obtain the best value to the Government, the Government may select an offeror(s) whose approach submitted in response to the Technical Factor has been assessed as credibly achieving higher Tier 2 performance levels up to the threshold and/or achieving higher performance levels up to the objective against the underbody Improvised Explosive Device threats specified in GCV IFV Performance Specification requirements 1925 and 1827 than a credible approach that achieves lower performance levels. The Government reserves the right to make less than three (3) awards if the value of additional awards up to three (3) would offer only limited benefit to achieving program requirements or based on affordability of three (3) awards. The Government may make no contract award if it concludes that no proposal is affordable and/or offers a reasonable probability of achieving program requirements.

M.3.1.2 Source Selection Authority. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) is the official designated to direct the source selection process and select the offeror(s) for contract award(s). A Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) will advise the SSA prior to the selection decision.

M.3.1.3 Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB). A SSEB has been established by the Government to evaluate proposals in response to this RFP. The SSEB is comprised of technically qualified individuals who have been selected to conduct this evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria listed for this RFP. Careful, full and impartial consideration will be given to all proposals received in response to this RFP. All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government personnel and Government support contractors (See L.1.3 and its subparagraphs).

M.3.1.4 Award with Discussions. This RFP includes FAR Provision 52.215-1 "Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition (Alternate I)" in Section L which advises that the Government intends to conduct discussions with offerors in the Competitive Range. Discussions will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.306. Since written and oral communications are limited prior to any competitive range determination (FAR 15.306 (c)), it is vitally important that the offeror's initial proposal be complete and comprehensive.

M.3.2 Determination of Responsibility. In accordance with FAR 9.103, contracts will be placed only with offerors that the Contracting Officer determines to be responsible, that is, those who satisfactorily demonstrate the capability to perform the necessary tasks and delivery of the required items on time. Prospective offerors, in order to qualify as sources for this acquisition, must be able to demonstrate that they meet the standards of responsibility as set forth in FAR 9.104. In addition, the Government may assess the offeror's financial capabilities to meet the RFP requirements. The Government reserves the right to conduct a Pre-Award Survey on any or all offerors (or their Major Subcontractors), to aid the Contracting Officer in the evaluation of each offeror's proposal and ensure that a selected offeror is responsible. Additional requirements of responsibility for this contract are the necessary DSS Facility and Information Systems clearances. An approved Earned Value Management System (EVMS) is also highly desirable. A DCMA approved Accounting System or a system operating under a DCMA approved Corrective Action Plan is required to be determined as responsible. In the event the offeror's EVMS is not currently approved, the appropriate Defense Contract Management Agency office will be contacted and the Government will determine the suitability of the offeror's current system in making its responsibility determination. In addition, the Government may take into consideration in making its responsibility determination the information the offeror submitted in response to Section L.6.1.6. No award can be made to an offeror who has been determined to be not responsible by the Contracting Officer. To make sure an offeror meets the responsibility criteria at FAR 9.104, the Government may:

- (1) arrange a visit to an offeror's plant and perform a necessary Pre-Award Survey, or
- (2) request an offeror to provide financial, technical, production, or managerial background information. If the requested information is not submitted within seven (7) days from the date of receipt of the request, or if offeror refuses the Government access to its facility, the Government may determine the offeror non-responsible. If the Government visits the offeror's facility, please ensure that current data relevant to its proposal is available for Government personnel to review.

M.4 Evaluation Criteria

There are five evaluation factors:

- (i) Factor I: Technical
- (ii) Factor II: Schedule
- (iii) Factor III: Price
- (iv) Factor IV: Past Performance
- (v) Factor V: Small Business Participation.

The Technical Factor is slightly more important than the Schedule Factor. The Schedule Factor is more important than the Price Factor. The Price Factor is more important than the Past Performance Factor. The Past Performance Factor is slightly more important than the Small Business Participation Factor. The non-Price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Price Factor.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-11-R-0001      MOD/AMD 0005</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Page 10 of 12</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

Except as specifically described in Section M.4.2.1 below, no evaluation credit will be given for exceeding the threshold requirements of the GCV IFV Performance Specification.

M.4.1 Importance of Price. Award(s) will be made to the responsible offeror(s) whose proposal(s) represents the best value to the Government. This may not be the offeror(s) with the lowest Price. However, the closer the offerors' evaluations are in those Factors other than the Price Factor, the more important Price becomes in the decision. Notwithstanding the relative order of importance of the five evaluation Factors stated herein, Price may be controlling when:

- a. proposals are otherwise considered approximately equal in the non-Price Factors; or
- b. an otherwise superior proposal is unaffordable in the TD phase; or
- c. the advantages of a proposal are not considered to be worth the price premium.

In spite of the non-Price Factors importance relative to Price, Price may play a deciding role in decisions for multiple awards to achieve program balance.

M.4.1.1 Affordability. The non-Price Factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Price Factor. However, no proposal or combination of proposals, no matter how low the risk/highly rated, will be considered for award if unaffordable for the Technology Development (TD) phase. This includes contract award affordability based on (a) the total available funding in FY11-FY13 and, (b) since the awards will be RDTE incrementally-funded contracts, available funding within each of the FY11-FY13 funding periods. Proposals that require funding in advance of availability may not be considered for award.

FY funding is not often available to the GCV Project Management Office prior to 07 November of each respective fiscal year. Offerors should account for this in their execution planning and resourcing.

Proposals requesting funding in excess of \$450,000,000 for the TD phase will be considered unaffordable.

M.4.2 Technical Factor (Factor 1). This factor includes the following three sub-factors: (1) Integrated Design, (2) Technical Approach and (3) Unit Manufacturing Cost (UMC). The Integrated Design Sub-factor is slightly more important than each of the Technical Approach and UMC Sub-factors. The Technical Approach and UMC Sub-factors are of equal importance.

M.4.2.1 Integrated Design Sub-factor (Sub-factor 1). The information submitted in response to the Integrated Design Sub-factor will be evaluated to assess the risk that:

- (a) The offeror's approach credibly meets the Tier 1 requirements specified in Attachment 025 including proposed performance, if any, above the threshold up to the objective against the underbody Improvised Explosive Device threats specified in requirements 1925 and 1827;
- (b) The offeror's approach credibly meets its proposed performance against the Tier 2 requirements specified in Attachment 025;
- (c) The initial concept credibly allocates space for all subsystems (to include space allowing for sway space, cables, hydraulic lines and other interfaces required for operation, access to remove/replace components at LRU level), for the crew and the nine-person Infantry squad, and for the Equipment Stowage List Requirements items it proposes;
- (d) The proposed approach will meet SOW C.20.4; and
- (e) The proposed Mobility architecture has power consumption estimates that accurately account for the applicable subsystems identified in its Product Structure; provides cooling/heat rejection estimates that accurately account for the applicable subsystems identified in its Product Structure, and, if proposing a tracked vehicle, an overall vehicle size conforming to an L/T ratio of 1.4 to 1.8 (no distinction will be drawn for L/T ratios between 1.4 and 1.8).

There will be no inherent advantage or inherent disadvantage to an offeror that selects the Army armor solutions as provided in the Classified Annex to this RFP. The solution will be evaluated on its own merits. With the exception of the evaluation of performance against the underbody Improvised Explosive Device threats specified in requirements 1925 and 1827, proposed performance beyond threshold will not receive any further evaluation credit, except to the extent such performance credibly reduces the risk of achieving the threshold. For evaluation of performance against the underbody Improvised Explosive Device threats specified in requirements 1925 and 1827, evaluation credit will be given up to the objective for performance levels that are assessed as credibly exceeding the threshold. Credible approaches that propose to achieve performance levels closer to the Tier 2 thresholds may be viewed more favorably than credible approaches that propose to achieve lower performance levels. In addition, credible approaches that propose to achieve performance levels up to the objective against the underbody Improvised Explosive Device threats specified in requirements 1925 and 1827 may be viewed more favorably than credible approaches that propose to achieve lower performance levels in those requirements.

M.4.2.2 Technical Approach Sub-factor (Sub-factor 2). The information submitted in response to the Technical Approach Sub-factor will be evaluated to assess the risk that the offeror understands the efforts to successfully design and develop the GCV IFV that meets all

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-11-R-0001      MOD/AMD 0005</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Page 11 of 12</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

of the Tier 1 Threshold requirements, and as many of the Tier 2-3 threshold requirements as possible to balance the achievement of the Army's GCV IFV Unit Manufacturing Cost target while minimizing the schedule risk in meeting the program's year seven (7) production date goal. An offeror's technical approach that does not show a process for trading off the Tier 2/3 requirements while balancing the achievement of the UMC target while minimizing the schedule risk may impose risk. Likewise, an approach that simply proposes to comply with the requirements, or an approach that proposes to use "best practices" in performing its technical approach without the required narrative explaining how those practices are specifically applied to the GCV IFV TD phase may also impose risk. In addition, a credible approach that proposes to meet all requirements but does not balance the achievement of the UMC target while minimizing schedule risk in meeting the programs year 7 production date goal may impose risk.

M.4.2.3 UMC Sub-factor (Sub-factor 3). The Government will assess the risk associated with the affordability of the offeror's GCV IFV initial concept by comparing the UMC estimate submitted in response to the UMC Sub-factor to be at or below \$10.5 million. As part of its risk assessment, the Government will:

- (a) Determine strengths and weaknesses associated with the completeness, credibility, and realism of the offeror's UMC estimate, and
- (b) Generate confidence levels and UMC values for the offeror's GCV IFV initial concept and compare it to \$10.5 million. Generate UMC values for the offeror's GCV IFV initial concept and assess confidence levels that the Government generated UMC values will be at or below \$10.5 million.

M.4.3 Schedule Factor (Factor 2). The information submitted in response to the Schedule Factor will be evaluated to assess the risk that the offeror will achieve the contractual requirements at the conclusion of GCV IFV TD phase and the Early Prototype (-) vehicle delivery in the EMD phase. The primary purpose of the substantiating data submitted for the Technology Readiness Level Self-Assessment Form is to document and verify the credibility of the offeror's proposed TRLs and to assess schedule risk impacts for all proposed TRLs, including modified TRL 6 or higher technologies.

M.4.4 Price Factor (Factor 3).

M.4.4.1 The information submitted in response to the Price Factor will be evaluated to assess the reasonableness and realism of the offeror's proposed Target Price reflected in CLIN 0001 in RFP Section B.

M.4.4.1.1 Reasonableness. The assessment of the proposed Target Price will include the consideration of reasonableness. A price is considered reasonable if it does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

M.4.4.1.2 Realism. Realism means that the offeror's proposed Target Price is consistent with its approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. The Government will evaluate the realism of the offeror's proposed Target Price by reviewing the offeror's proposal, as supported by the proposal's cost element build-up, to assess whether the proposed Target Price reflects the offeror's proposed approach. Where the offeror's proposed Target Price lacks realism relative to its approach, the evaluations under the Technical and/or Schedule Factors (and the applicable Sub-factors) may reflect increased risk. In the event the offeror proposes any cost decrements as described in L.6.1.6, the Government may consider the realism of such decrements in its assessment.

M.4.5 Past Performance Factor (Factor 4).

M.4.5.1 The Past Performance Factor will assess the risk associated with the probability that the offeror will successfully perform the contract based on the offeror's and Subcontractors record of past performance on recent and relevant contracts. The offeror may also be evaluated based on other internal Government or private source information. In this regard, the Government may utilize the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), and/or any other available Government database to search for recent and relevant offeror performance and ratings.

M.4.5.2 Unknown Risk: offerors without a record of recent and relevant past performance will be rated as "Unknown Risk", which is neither favorable nor unfavorable.

M.4.6 Small Business Participation Factor (Factor 5).

M.4.6.1 The Government will evaluate the extent of first-tier small business participation (in terms of the offeror's proposed Total Contract Target Price) which the offeror credibly proposes to subcontract to U.S. small business (SB) concerns (including (SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB, and/or SDVOSB) in the performance of the contract. For the purpose of this evaluation, the extent of offeror (or joint venture partner/teaming arrangement) participation in proposed contract performance, where the offeror is a U.S. small business concern, for NAICS code 336992, will also be considered small business participation.

M.4.6.2 The evaluation will consist of the following:

- a. The extent to which the proposal identifies participation by U.S. small business concerns to achieve the Governments SB subcontracting goals (to include, as described above, the participation of the offeror if it is a U.S. small business concern). The extent of participation of such concerns will be evaluated in terms of the percentage of the offeror's proposed Total Contract Target Price. The Governments subcontracting goals for small business participation are:

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued		Page 12 of 12
	PIIN/SIIN	W56HZV-11-R-0001MOD/AMD 0005	
Name of Offeror or Contractor:			

20% for SBs  
2% for SDBs  
2% for WOSBs  
1.3% for HubZone SBs  
1.3% for VOSBs  
1.3% for SDVOSBs

b. An assessment of the realism, that includes strengths and weaknesses, that the offeror will achieve the levels of small business participation identified in the proposal. This assessment will be based on an assessment of the offeror's proposed small business participation approach and the probability that the offeror will satisfy commitments and requirements, on the instant contract, based upon the extent of satisfaction of FAR 52.219-8 and/or FAR 52.219-9 (as applicable) commitments on prior contracts.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE M0001 \*\*\*